UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,039	02/05/2002	Oliver Schreck	P02,0018	3794

26574 7590 05/02/2007

SCHIFF HARDIN, LLP
PATENT DEPARTMENT
6600 SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-6473

EXAMINER	
ROY, BAISAKHI	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3737	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/072,039	SCHRECK, OLIVER	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Baisakhi Roy	3737	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 February 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 2/27/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to Rittman, III et al., this reference was introduced to meet the claim limitation of storing an image with icons representing obtaining an image data with or without stimulation. Rittman, III et al. clearly teach obtaining image data including MR imaging data, also manipulation of image data, with the display including icons for the selection and display of parameters such as stimulation parameters. Therefore the reference teaches the interrelationship or interaction between the collection/manipulation of MR image data and selection of parameters on the display (col. 10 lines 45-65) and storing said image data and the parameters or icons (col. 12 lines 24-50). Jesmanowicz et al. do not teach separate icons independent of the picture elements indicating whether image was obtained with or without stimulation. However Jesmanowicz et al. do teach a graphical representation separate from the picture elements indicating the time varying NMR signal at any location in the brain (col. 3 lines 35-40). Also, the reference teaches displaying the functional response of the brain separately for each stimulus by enabling the operator to make the appropriate selection corresponding in frequency to that of the applied stimulus to distinguish between the different types of applied stimuli to improve the efficiency of the procedure (col. 14 lines 59-65). It would be obvious to apply a teaching that clearly uses labeled icons to further indicate to the operator whether an image was obtained with or without stimulation and the type of stimulation. The teaching in Rittman, III et al. was combined with

Jesmanowicz et al. such that imaging parameters such as images obtained with or without stimulation can be displayed and stored separate from the picture elements as icons to provide clarity to the user (col. 1 lines 19-25). Therefore graphics display would indicate to the user whether image was taken with or without stimulation and where these parameters are stored to assure reproducibility of the settings to reduce the chance of errors and time and maintain consistency of clinical results. The previous rejection is therefore maintained and repeated below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jesmanowicz et al. in view of Rittman, III et al. (6451015).

Regarding claims 1, 2, 4-6, 7, 14, and 15, Jesmanowicz et al. disclose a method and apparatus for functional MRI including obtaining and storing a plurality of images with and without stimulation together with information indicating whether the image was registered with or without stimulation and with at least one image related stimulation value such as the type of stimulation and information describing a point in time of said stimulation (col. 2 lines 41-67, col. 10 lines 45-60). Jesmanowicz et al. further teach determining an "image-related correlation values" or images wherein points of highest intensity correspond to points of highest correlation or coincidence to better differentiate

between activated and non-activated brain regions (col. 3 lines 6-18, col. 6 lines 23-38 and claim 1). The reference further teaches filtering out some images that should be ignored during the evaluation (col. 3 lines 51-66). In reference to the storage of each image with information independent of the picture elements or the storage of parameters with the image, Jesmanowicz et al. do not explicitly teach storing of image data with information different from the image and a pressure and acoustic stimulus. In the same field of endeavor, Rittman, III et al. disclose a MR method where imaging parameters different from the image data, stimulation modes are stored with the image data (col. 7 lines 41-49, col. 10 lines 34-45). It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the teaching by Rittman, III et al. to modify the teaching by Jesmanowicz et al. for the purpose of providing all relevant information together with the image data and therefore enable user to access and interact with the various icons and enable evaluation at a later point in time (col. 6 lines 29-35).

Regarding claims 3, 9, 12, and 13, Jesmanowicz et al. further teach triggering a neural activity by a stimulus or sensory stimulator which could be in the form of optical stimulation and a stimulation source to measure the pulse intensity of an electrical pulse (col. 10 lines 45-60).

Regarding claim 8, Jesmanowicz et al. teach obtaining information describing the intensity level of the applied stimulus (col. 2 lines 57-60).

3. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jesmanowicz et al. in view of Albert (6377833).

Regarding claims 1, 2, 4-6, 7, 14, and 15, Jesmanowicz et al. disclose a method and apparatus for functional MRI including obtaining and storing a plurality of images with and without stimulation together with information indicating whether the image was registered with or without stimulation and with at least one image related stimulation value such as the type of stimulation and information describing a point in time of said stimulation (col. 2 lines 41-67, col. 10 lines 45-60). Jesmanowicz et al. further teach determining an "image-related correlation values" or images wherein points of highest intensity correspond to points of highest correlation or coincidence to better differentiate between activated and non-activated brain regions (col. 3 lines 6-18, col. 6 lines 23-38 and claim 1). The reference further teaches filtering out some images that should be ignored during the evaluation (col. 3 lines 51-66). In reference to the storage of each image with information independent of the picture elements or the storage of parameters with the image, Jesmanowicz et al. do not explicitly teach storing of image data with information different from the image and a pressure and acoustic stimulus. In the same field of endeavor, Albert discloses a fMRI method where imaging parameters different from the image data, stimulation modes are stored with the image data (col. 2 lines 9-56, col. 11 lines 40-67, col. 13 lines 14-25). It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the teaching by Albert to modify the teaching by Jesmanowicz et al. for the purpose of providing all relevant information together with the image data and therefore enable user to access and interact with the various icons and enable evaluation at a later point in time.

Regarding claims 3, 9, 12, and 13, Jesmanowicz et al. further teach triggering a neural activity by a stimulus or sensory stimulator which could be in the form of optical stimulation and a stimulation source to measure the pulse intensity of an electrical pulse (col. 10 lines 45-60).

Regarding claim 8, Jesmanowicz et al. teach obtaining information describing the intensity level of the applied stimulus (col. 2 lines 57-60).

Conclusion

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Baisakhi Roy whose telephone number is 571-272-7139. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30 a.m. - 4p.m.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian L. Casler can be reached on 571-272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BR

BR

BRIAN L. CASLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700